ERC MINUTES December 19, 2013

# STATE WORKFORCE INNOVATION COUNCIL (SWIC) EDUCATIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (ERC)

December 19, 2013 8:30 – 9:45 a.m. Indiana Government Center South Conference Room 130 Indianapolis, IN

**Present:** Dan Clark, Leroy Jackson, Derek Redelman, Rebecca Nickoli

**Absent:** Tim Skinner, Dennis Rohrs

Also present from the Indiana Department of Workforce Development (DWD): Marie Mackintosh, Amanda Brewer, Cory Mahon, Melinda McKinney, Chris Fitzgerald and Donna Lovelady.

At 8:36 a.m., the meeting was called to order by Dan Clark.

The November 14, 2013 meeting minutes\* were reviewed. Mr. Redelman moved to accept the minutes; Rebecca Nickoli seconded the motion. All approved and the motion was carried.

### <u>High School Equivalency (HSE) Assessment – TASC – Policy Review</u>

Daniel Lewis, Chief Research Advisor at CTB/McGraw-Hill (CTB), presented the research on the cut scores for TASC, via webinar/conference call. (For complete information, the PowerPoint presentation is available upon request.)

#### Discussion

- Mention was made about employer confidence in a high school equivalency certificate and the need to monitor assessment trends as high school standards change.
- Criterion- versus norm-referenced testing was discussed with the hope that TASC will move toward criterion-referencing as soon as possible. (A criterion-referenced test is one that provides for translating test scores into a statement about the behavior to be expected of a person with that score or their relationship to a specified subject matter. The objective is simply to see whether the student has learned the material. Norm-referenced tests identify whether the test taker performed better or worse than other test takers, not whether the test taker knows either more or less material than is necessary for a given purpose.)
- A concern was raised regarding the number of students entering post-secondary institutions needing remediation; will TASC improve this situation? It may take six or seven years to have viable information from TASC testing regarding the need for remediation.
- TASC hopefully will not restrict student options by funneling them into only community colleges or proprietary schools, but give them a wide choice of options.
- Field testing data was collected prior to testing and included students from Indiana and four country regions; operational testing data will be collected after test has been conducted for some time.

ERC MINUTES December 19, 2013

- The policy point on testing eligibility/age requirement was discussed:
  - o Remove the "superintendent recommendation" portion because it could be misinterpreted as allowing testing without exiting from school.
  - o Replace the original Candidate Eligibility language:

## TASC Candidate Eligibility

The TASC tests may be administered only to individuals who meet the following minimum guidelines:

- Does not hold a diploma from an accredited high school or its equivalent; and
- Is a resident of the state of Indiana for a minimum of thirty (30) days immediately preceding the day of testing; and
- Has officially exited high school; and
- *Is at least eighteen (18) years of age;* 
  - Or is at least sixteen (16) years of age, if a superintendent (as defined in IC 20-18-2-21) recommends that the individual participate in the testing program.

#### **REVISED**

The Indiana HSE test may be administered only to individuals who meet the following minimum guidelines:

- Does not hold a diploma from an accredited high school or its equivalent; and
- Is a resident of the state of Indiana for a minimum of thirty (30) days immediately preceding the day of testing; and
- Either
- Has officially exited high school; or
- o Is at least eighteen (18) years of age;
- The test can be "purchased" by sub-test, rather than the entire battery.
- Test site contracts were due out from CTB the week of December 16, 2013.

Derek Redelman moved to recommend approval of the TASC policy, as amended, to the SWIC. Leroy Jackson seconded the motion; all approved and the motion was carried.

Other agenda items were postponed until the next meeting.

No public comments were made.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:58 a.m.